

REMARKS

The present amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated February 7, 2008. Claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Claims 10, 20, 30 and 40-44 have been cancelled. And claims 2-5, 12-15, 22-25 and 32-35 were previously canceled. Therefore, claims 1, 6-9, 11, 16-19, 21, 26-29, 31, and 36-39 are again presented for consideration in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 6-9, 11, 16-19, 21, 26-29, 31 and 36-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,845,077 ("*Fawcett*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,656 ("*Hrastar*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,058,476 ("*Matsuzaki*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 have been amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 41, 42, 43 and 44, respectively, as well as other limitations identified *supra*. Applicants submit that *Fawcett*, *Hrastar* and *Matsuzaki*, either alone or in the applied combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the limitations in the independent claims.

By way of example only, claim 1 requires "storing said update program in a storage location; decoding said transmitted key ID to obtain said MAC address; storing said MAC address in a location different than said storage location of said update program." Claim 11 requires "said one receiving terminal converts said transmitted key ID back to said MAC address and then stores said MAC address in a location different than said storage location of said update program." Claim 21 requires "said one receiving terminal is operable to store said update program in said storage location, to generate said transfer request, to decode said received key ID into said MAC address, and to store said MAC address in a location different than said

storage location." And claim 31 requires "at said one receiving terminal validating a received key ID directly associated with said received unique terminal information with an assigned key ID generated at the receiving terminal; storing said received key ID and said update program received by said one receiving terminal in a storage location; and upon validating the received key ID with the assigned key ID: retrieving said received key ID from said storage location; decoding said retrieved key ID to obtain said MAC address; storing said MAC address in a location different than said storage location of said update program." Applicants submit that the applied combination of references fails to meet a *prima facie* case of obviousness for these and other limitations of the independent claims.

In view of the above, applicants submit that independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 are in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, claims 6-9, 16-19, 26-29 and 36-39 depend from claims 1, 11, 21 and 31, respectively, and contain all the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least this reason, applicants submit that the subject dependent claims are likewise in condition for allowance.

Claims 10, 20, 30, 40 and 41-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Fawcett*, *Hrastar* and *Matsuzaki* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,835,725 ("*Chiang*"). These claims have been cancelled, thereby mooted the rejection.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Office Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have. If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: May 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andrew T. Zidel
Registration No.: 45,256
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant